UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/532,402	03/22/2000	Michael A. Kepler	1631077-0031	8303

7590 04/19/2005

Alex L Yip
Kaye Scholer LLP
425 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10022

EXAMINER	
LY, ANH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/532,402	KEPLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anh Ly	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 February 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-8 and 10-35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-8 and 10-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 March 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *02/23/2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to Applicants' Petition for Withdraw Abandonment filed on 02/23/2004.

2. Claims 4 and 9 are cancelled (dated 09/17/2002.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-35 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,724,575 issued to Hoover et al. (hereinafter Hoover) in view of US Patent No. 6,374,241 issued to Lamburt et al. (hereinafter Lamburt).

With respect to claim 1, Hoover teaches searching at least one database for database records responsive to the query (searching at least one of the heterogeneous databases in the distributed computing systems in geographically dispersed databases: abstract, col. 30, lines 50-62, see figs. 11, 21; also see col. col. 1, lines 8-18 and lines 48-54) and

searching an update database associated with the at least one database for an update record responsive to the query (searching to update database: col. 43, lines 10-36; also col. 15, lines 42-56).

Hoover teaches searching one or more heterogeneous database over a network in the distributed computing systems stored geographically dispersed databases with the query displaying in the screen and searching the update database as an transaction to collect or group related actions associated with a particular event (col. 30, lines 50-67, col. 31, lines 1-67 and fig. 14, col. 34, lines 50-67). Hoover does not clearly teach determining whether an indication is made in the update record and including in the search output the records responsive to the query except one or more of the database records which correspond to the update record when the indication is made in the update record.

However Lamburt teaches determining update record to the existing working database (col. 39, lines 60-67 and col. 40, lines 1-15), and the search results based on

the user-specified search criteria (fig. 30, col. 10, lines 46-56, col. 17, lines 40-64 and col. 44, 15-30 and lines 58-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hoover with the teachings of Lamburt, wherein the searching databases over the network based on the query from the screen in the system provided therein (Hoover's fig. 21), would incorporate the use of determining update record to the working database from the search result or output, in the same conventional manner as described by Lamburt (col. 39, lines 60-67 and col. 17, lines 40-64). The motivation being to enable the user to search, access and update the distributed database records over the network quickly and efficiently.

With respect to claims 2-3, Hoover teaches a method for providing a search output as discussed in claim 1.

Hoover teaches searching one or more heterogeneous database over a network in the distributed computing systems stored geographically dispersed databases with the query displaying in the screen and searching the update database as an transaction to collect or group related actions associated with a particular event (col. 30, lines 50-67, col. 31, lines 1-67 and fig. 14, col. 34, lines 50-67). Hoover does not clearly teach excluded from the search output and at least predefined value.

However, Lamburt teaches the indication is a delete indicator, the update record is also excluded from the search output (col. 44, lines 15-30 and lines 58-63) and one field configurable to at least one predefined value (col. 66, lines 44-48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hoover with the teachings of Lamburt, wherein the searching databases over the network based on the query from the screen in the system provided therein (Hoover's fig. 21), would incorporate the use of determining update record to the working database from the search result or output, in the same conventional manner as described by Lamburt (col. 39, lines 60-67 and col. 17, lines 40-64). The motivation being to enable the user to search, access and update the distributed database records over the network quickly and efficiently.

With respect to claim 5, Hoover teaches identifying one or more update databases associated with the at least one database (abstract, col. 1, lines 8-30 and col. 6, lines 28-52).

With respect to claim 6, Hoover teaches maintaining a search-routing database (col. 6, lines 21-51); receiving the query from a user, said query comprised of search request data in a plurality of search request fields of predetermined types (col. 30, lines 50-67 and col. 31, lines 1-67 and col. 34, lines 50-67); selecting search request data in at least one of the search fields (col. 49, lines 12-54); searching said search-routing database for one or more database identifiers, based on the selected search request data (col. 6, lines 28-67); and routing the query to the databases identified by said database identifiers and the update databases associated therewith (col. 25, lines 8-20 and col. 26, lines 52-67; also see col. 21, lines 15-45 and col. 22, lines 28-50).

With respect to claim 7, Hoover teaches a plurality of databases, said databases including database records having database fields (relational databases having

database records, which is having database record fields or column: abstract, col. 15, lines 4-26);

one or more update databases, said update databases including update records having update database fields (update database fields: see fig. 3, col. 15, lines 42-56 and col. 23, lines 4-18); and

and a sorter for generating the responsive records resulting from the search of the databases and the at least one update database (col. 23, lines 20-35 and col. 24, lines 8-20).

Hoover teaches searching one or more heterogeneous database over a network in the distributed computing systems stored geographically dispersed databases with the query displaying in the screen and searching the update database as an transaction to collect or group related actions associated with a particular event (col. 30, lines 50-67, col. 31, lines 1-67 and fig. 14, col. 34, lines 50-67). Hoover does not clearly teach a search engine for searching one or more of the plurality of databases for database records responsive to the query, returning the database records responsive to the query, searching at least one of the update databases associated with the plurality of databases for an update record responsive to the query, and determining whether an indication is made an update database filed of the update record and including in the search output the records responsive to the query except one or more of the database records which correspond to the update record when the indication is made in the update database field of the update record.

However Lamburt teaches search engines for searching databases for database records based on the search query or search criteria: col. 22, lines 12-35; determining update record to the existing working database (col. 39, lines 60-67 and col. 40, lines 1-15; see fig. 4, query engine, item 862: col. 6, lines 25-35 and col. 20, lines 35-51), and the search results based on the user-specified search criteria (fig. 30, col. 10, lines 46-56, col. 17, lines 40-64 and col. 44, 15-30 and lines 58-63; col. 16, lines 7-24 and col. 33, lines 12-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hoover with the teachings of Lamburt, wherein the searching databases over the network based on the query from the screen in the system provided therein (Hoover's fig. 21), would incorporate the use of determining update record to the working database from the search result or output, in the same conventional manner as described by Lamburt (col. 39, lines 60-67 and col. 17, lines 40-64). The motivation being to enable the user to search, access and update the distributed database records over the network quickly and efficiently.

With respect to claim 8, Hoover teaches a system for providing a search output as discussed in claim 7.

Hoover teaches searching one or more heterogeneous database over a network in the distributed computing systems stored geographically dispersed databases with the query displaying in the screen and searching the update database as an transaction to collect or group related actions associated with a particular event (col. 30, lines 50-

67, col. 31, lines 1-67 and fig. 14, col. 34, lines 50-67). Hoover does not clearly teach the update record is also excluded from the search output.

However, Lamburt teaches the indication is a delete indicator, the update record is also excluded from the search output (col. 44, lines 15-30 and lines 58-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hoover with the teachings of Lamburt, wherein the searching databases over the network based on the query from the screen in the system provided therein (Hoover's fig. 21), would incorporate the use of determining update record to the working database from the search result or output, in the same conventional manner as described by Lamburt (col. 39, lines 60-67 and col. 17, lines 40-64). The motivation being to enable the user to search, access and update the distributed database records over the network quickly and efficiently.

With respect to claim 10, Hoover teaches a search-routing database; an input device for receiving the query from a user, the query comprised of search request data in search request fields of predetermined types and a search router for receiving the query and selecting search request data in at least one of the search fields; wherein the search engines is configured for searching said search-routing database for one or more database identifiers, said one or more database identifiers identifying the one or more of the plurality of databases (col. 6, lines 21-51; col. 30, lines 50-67 and col. 31, lines 1-67 and col. 34, lines 50-67; col. 49, lines 12-54; col. 6, lines 28-67; and col. 25, lines 8-20 and col. 26, lines 52-67; also see col. 21, lines 15-45 and col. 22, lines 28-50).

With respect to 11, Hoover teaches a table for identifying the at least one update database associated with the one or more of the plurality of databases (abstract, col. 21, lines 15-28, col. 22, lines 12-28; also col. 1, lines 8-30 and col. 6, lines 28-52).

With respect to claim 12, Hoover teaches having one or more databases accessible for searching, searching a routing database to determine whether the search request should be routed to the one or more databases; routing the search request to the one or more databases accessible; searching the one or more databases of the receiving server (relational databases having database records, which is having database record fields or column: abstract, col. 15, lines 4-26; update database fields: see fig. 3, col. 15, lines 42-56 and col. 23, lines 4-18, accessing the databases for searching: col. 2, lines 47-56 and col. 6, lines 22-45; col. 23, lines 20-35 and col. 24, lines 8-20).

Hoover teaches searching one or more heterogeneous database over a network in the distributed computing systems stored geographically dispersed databases with the query displaying in the screen and searching the update database as an transaction to collect or group related actions associated with a particular event (col. 30, lines 50-67, col. 31, lines 1-67 and fig. 14, col. 34, lines 50-67). Hoover does not clearly teach a search request at a receiving server and returning the results of the search.

However, Lamburt teaches the search request at a receiving server routing the search request by the receiving server and returning the results of the search (col. 14, lines 45-64; abstract and col. 18, lines 14-60; col. 11, lines 13-31; col. 8, lines 24-42 and col. 17, lines 40-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hoover with the teachings of Lamburt, wherein the searching databases over the network based on the query from the screen in the system provided therein (Hoover's fig. 21), would incorporate the use of determining update record to the working database from the search result or output, in the same conventional manner as described by Lamburt (col. 39, lines 60-67 and col. 17, lines 40-64). The motivation being to enable the user to search, access and update the distributed database records over the network quickly and efficiently.

With respect to claims 13-15, Hoover teaches a system for providing a search output as discussed in claim 12.

Hoover teaches searching one or more heterogeneous database over a network in the distributed computing systems stored geographically dispersed databases with the query displaying in the screen and searching the update database as an transaction to collect or group related actions associated with a particular event (col. 30, lines 50-67, col. 31, lines 1-67 and fig. 14, col. 34, lines 50-67). Hoover does not clearly teach analyzing the search request, the search request should not be routed to the databases accessible by the receiving server and wherein said second server is remotely located from the receiving server.

However, Lamburt teaches the search request and receiving server (col. 14, lines 45-64 and col. 18, lines 14-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hoover with the teachings

of Lamburt, wherein the searching databases over the network based on the query from the screen in the system provided therein (Hoover's fig. 21), would incorporate the use of determining update record to the working database from the search result or output, in the same conventional manner as described by Lamburt (col. 39, lines 60-67 and col. 17, lines 40-64). The motivation being to enable the user to search, access and update the distributed database records over the network quickly and efficiently.

With respect to claims 16-19, Hoover teaches a system for providing a search output as discussed in claim 12.

Hoover teaches searching one or more heterogeneous database over a network in the distributed computing systems stored geographically dispersed databases with the query displaying in the screen and searching the update database as an transaction to collect or group related actions associated with a particular event (col. 30, lines 50-67, col. 31, lines 1-67 and fig. 14, col. 34, lines 50-67). Hoover does not clearly teach routing the search request, merging the search results, the search request to the one or more database and the routing of the search request to the one or more databases accessible by the second server.

However, Lamburt teaches the search request and receiving server (col. 14, lines 45-64 and col. 18, lines 14-60; also see col. 18, lines 15-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hoover with the teachings of Lamburt, wherein the searching databases over the network based on the query from the screen in the system provided therein (Hoover's fig. 21), would incorporate the use

of determining update record to the working database from the search result or output, in the same conventional manner as described by Lamburt (col. 39, lines 60-67 and col. 17, lines 40-64). The motivation being to enable the user to search, access and update the distributed database records over the network quickly and efficiently.

Claim 20 is essentially the same as claim 12 except that it is directed to a system for routing search requests rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 12 hereinabove.

Claim 21 is essentially the same as claim 13 except that it is directed to a system for routing search requests rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 13 hereinabove.

Claim 22 is essentially the same as claim 14 except that it is directed to a system for routing search requests rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 14 hereinabove.

Claim 23 is essentially the same as claim 15 except that it is directed to a system for routing search requests rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 15 hereinabove.

Claim 24 is essentially the same as claim 18 except that it is directed to a system for routing search requests rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 18 hereinabove.

Claim 25 is essentially the same as claim 19 except that it is directed to a system for routing search requests rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 19 hereinabove.

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 16 except that it is directed to a system for routing search requests rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 16 hereinabove.

With respect to claims 27-28, Hoover teaches a system for providing a search output as discussed in claim 20.

Hoover teaches searching one or more heterogeneous database over a network in the distributed computing systems stored geographically dispersed databases with the query displaying in the screen and searching the update database as an transaction to collect or group related actions associated with a particular event (col. 30, lines 50-67, col. 31, lines 1-67 and fig. 14, col. 34, lines 50-67). Hoover does not clearly teach receiving server routes the search request, merging the search results.

However, Lamburt teaches the search request and receiving server and merging data (col. 14, lines 45-64 and col. 18, lines 14-60; also see col. 18, lines 15-60; col. 38, lines 5-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hoover with the teachings of Lamburt, wherein the searching databases over the network based on the query from the screen in the system provided therein (Hoover's fig. 21), would incorporate the use of determining update record to the working database from the search result or output, in the same conventional manner as described by Lamburt (col. 39, lines 60-67 and col. 17, lines 40-64). The motivation being to enable the user to search, access and update the distributed database records over the network quickly and efficiently.

With respect to claim 29, Hoover teaches maintaining a routing database for identifying one or more database to search; searching the routing database to determine at least one route to one or more databases to search, a database identified by the routing database (relational databases having database records, which is having database record fields or column: abstract, col. 15, lines 4-26; update database fields: see fig. 3, col. 15, lines 42-56 and col. 23, lines 4-18, accessing the databases for searching: col. 2, lines 47-56 and col. 6, lines 22-45; col. 23, lines 20-35 and col. 24, lines 8-20).

Hoover teaches searching one or more heterogeneous database over a network in the distributed computing systems stored geographically dispersed databases with the query displaying in the screen and searching the update database as an transaction to collect or group related actions associated with a particular event (col. 30, lines 50-67, col. 31, lines 1-67 and fig. 14, col. 34, lines 50-67). Hoover does not clearly teach a search request at a receiving server and returning the results of the search.

However, Lamburt teaches the search request at a receiving server routing the search request by the receiving server and returning the results of the search (col. 14, lines 45-64; abstract and col. 18, lines 14-60; col. 11, lines 13-31; col. 8, lines 24-42 and col. 17, lines 40-64) and routing the search request to a database by one or more default routes (col. 14, lines 45-64; abstract and col. 18, lines 14-60; col. 11, lines 13-31; col. 8, lines 24-42 and col. 17, lines 40-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hoover with the teachings

of Lamburt, wherein the searching databases over the network based on the query from the screen in the system provided therein (Hoover's fig. 21), would incorporate the use of determining update record to the working database from the search result or output, in the same conventional manner as described by Lamburt (col. 39, lines 60-67 and col. 17, lines 40-64). The motivation being to enable the user to search, access and update the distributed database records over the network quickly and efficiently.

With respect to claims 30-35, Hoover teaches a method for routing search requests as discussed in claim 29.

Hoover teaches searching one or more heterogeneous database over a network in the distributed computing systems stored geographically dispersed databases with the query displaying in the screen and searching the update database as an transaction to collect or group related actions associated with a particular event (col. 30, lines 50-67, col. 31, lines 1-67 and fig. 14, col. 34, lines 50-67). Hoover does not clearly teach analyzing the search request, identify one or more databases to which the search request should be routed, the one or more default routes if the search request does not include a field that is used for routing, the one or more default routes if the search request includes a field that is used for routing but the data populating the field does not correspond to any entries in the routing databases.

However, Lamburt teaches the search request at a receiving server routing the search request by the receiving server and returning the results of the search (col. 14, lines 45-64; abstract and col. 18, lines 14-60; col. 11, lines 13-31; col. 8, lines 24-42 and col. 17, lines 40-64) and routing the search request to a database by one or more

default routes (col. 14, lines 45-64; abstract and col. 7, lines 14-59, col. 18, lines 14-60; col. 11, lines 13-31; col. 8, lines 24-42 and col. 17, lines 40-64; col. 58, lines 35-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hoover with the teachings of Lamburt, wherein the searching databases over the network based on the query from the screen in the system provided therein (Hoover's fig. 21), would incorporate the use of determining update record to the working database from the search result or output, in the same conventional manner as described by Lamburt (col. 39, lines 60-67 and col. 17, lines 40-64). The motivation being to enable the user to search, access and update the distributed database records over the network quickly and efficiently.

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV **or fax to (571) 273-4039**. The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see **http://pair-direct.uspto.gov**. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: Central Fax Center (703) 872-9306

JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ANH LY
APR. 12th, 2005